COMMONWEALTH OF KENTUCKY CABINET FOR HEALTH AND FAMILY SERVICES DEPARTMENT FOR MEDICAID SERVICES

IN RE: PRIMARY CARE TAC MEETING

APPEARANCES

Mike Caudill CHAIRMAN

Yvonne Agan Chris Keyser Barry Martin TAC MEMBER PRESENT

Teresa Cooper
Edward Conners
Mary Elam
David Bolt
John Inman
Molly Lewis
Stephanie Hall
Chuck Morgan
KENTUCKY PRIMARY CARE
ASSOCIATION

CAPITAL CITY COURT REPORTING TERRI H. PELOSI, COURT REPORTER 900 CHESTNUT DRIVE FRANKFORT, KENTUCKY 40601 (502) 223-1118

APPEARANCES (Continued)

Veronica Cecil
Angela Parker
Steve Bechtel
Lee Guice
Amy Richardson
MEDICAID SERVICES

Court Reporter's Note: At the request of DMS, all other participants appearing via Zoom or telephonically will not be listed under Appearances.)

AGENDA

- 1. Call to Order
- 2. Establishment of a Quorum
- 3. Review and approval of previous meeting transcript A. March 2021
- 4. Old Business
 - A. Report on Wrap/Cross Over Claims Clean-up July 1, 2014 to present update from DMS
 - B. Payments for COVID-19 Vaccine Administration update from DMS
- 5. New Business
 - A. Presentation on payment methodology for same day multiple visits
 - B. Updates or Announcements from the MCOs
 - C. Recommendations to the MAC
 - D. Confirmation of Chair to attend MAC meeting May 27, 2021 10:00 AM 12:30 PM
 - E. New items for discussion
 - F. Next Meeting July 1, 2021 10:00 AM 12:30PM
- 6. Adjournment

| 1 | MR. CAUDILL: I've got 10:01. |
|----|--|
| 2 | So, if there's no reason for delaying, I'll go ahead |
| 3 | and call this meeting to order. |
| 4 | For the purpose of establishing |
| 5 | a quorum, I'm here. Chris Keyser, are you here? |
| 6 | MS. KEYSER: Present. |
| 7 | MR. CAUDILL: Good. Yvonne? |
| 8 | MS. AGAN: Present. |
| 9 | MR. CAUDILL: Barry? |
| 10 | MR. MARTIN: Barely. |
| 11 | MR. CAUDILL: Barely Barry is |
| 12 | here. Okay. Raynor Mullins? Raynor emailed me last |
| 13 | night that he had a medical appointment that he had |
| 14 | to take and may or may not be able to join us today. |
| 15 | So, he's not here when we're starting, but if |
| 16 | everything concludes timely for him, maybe he can |
| 17 | join us before this is over. |
| 18 | So, that's four out of five. |
| 19 | That's a quorum. |
| 20 | Would someone like to introduce |
| 21 | the Medicaid staff that's in attendance today? |
| 22 | MS. CECIL: Good morning, Mike |
| 23 | and members of the TAC. This is Veronica Cecil with |
| | |

though you see her name. Donna Clark has been

25

grateful enough to help us get started this morning.

I am going to try to share my screen for the agenda. We'll see if that works.

(INTRODUCTIONS)

MR. CAUDILL: Would someone like to identify the members of the Kentucky Primary Care Association that's on?

(INTRODUCTIONS)

MR. CAUDILL: Thank you. My agenda is misnumbered. So, five becomes four and six becomes five and seven becomes six to make it in line with how I was taught my numbers go anyway. Four is missing on that.

Having said that, then, it is time to address Old Business, and the first order on that is a report on the wrap/crossover claims of July 1, 2014 to the present, and we're asking for an update from DMS on that.

MS. KEYSER: Mike, this is Chris. I'm sorry. Do we need to approve the minutes from the previous meeting?

MR. CAUDILL: You know? We do and that's my bad. So, let me step back, then, and ask if there's any changes or modifications to be discussed to the meeting transcript of 3/4 of '21?

1 If there's not, the Chair will 2 entertain a motion to approve those as distributed. MS. KEYSER: So moved. 3 This is 4 Chris. 5 MR. CAUDILL: Thank you, Chris. 6 Is there a second to that? 7 MS. AGAN: Yes. This is Yvonne. 8 I will second. 9 MR. CAUDILL: Thank you, Yvonne. All those in favor say aye. All those opposed say 10 likewise. The motion to approve the previous meeting 11 12 transcript passes. 13 Now let us go to Old Business under A and, Veronica, will you be addressing that? 14 15 MS. CECIL: Yes, sir. So, we 16 did have the first wrap workgroup, well-attended. was Managed Care Organizations, our providers, 17 18 members from the Primary Care TAC, from the Kentucky 19 Primary Care Association, obviously Department staff, and staff from the Office of Application Technology 20 21 Services (OATS), our IT sister agency. 22 I thought it went very well. 23 It was very informative. We asked for feedback from that meeting and we did receive feedback from nine 24

organizations. So, we are taking that back and going

25

through that information.

We're trying to schedule the second workgroup meeting and just I'm having a little difficulty in aligning some of the key participants to make sure that we've got the technical people on and providers represented.

So, I hope to get the invite out to that today because I do have to reach out to some individuals and ask them if they could be available for different days that they did not indicate.

So, hopefully, that invitation will go out. That meeting will happen in two weeks. And as part of that agenda, we will be hearing from the provider side about Medicare billing.

I think that will be very helpful to the Department to understand that side of it from the provider perspective. So, we appreciate the willingness for that kind of presentation.

So, that's where we are right now on resolution of the wrap. Any questions?

MR. CAUDILL: So, the issues that were discussed in the workgroup meeting, do those correspond with the issues that you referred to at our last meeting of this committee as needing to

| i | . |
|----|---|
| 1 | be addressed? |
| 2 | MS. CECIL: Yes. And we do plan |
| 3 | at the next workgroup meeting to dive in a little |
| 4 | further based on the feedback from the different |
| 5 | stakeholders to help us. |
| 6 | Again, the goal of this is to |
| 7 | develop resolutions to the problems that affect the |
| 8 | generation of an accurate and timely wrap. And, |
| 9 | then, what do we do about going backwards to try to |
| 10 | ensure that providers were paid appropriately? |
| 11 | MS. KEYSER: Mike, this is |
| 12 | Chris. I've got a question. |
| 13 | MR. CAUDILL: Yes, Chris. |
| 14 | MS. KEYSER: It's for Veronica. |
| 15 | Veronica, are there minutes kept of the workgroup |
| 16 | session? |
| 17 | MS. CECIL: We do not keep |
| 18 | specific minutes. |
| 19 | MS. KEYSER: Is there like an |
| 20 | agenda or something that can be shared so this |
| 21 | committee has an idea as far as what topics were |
| 22 | covered? |
| 23 | MS. CECIL: Oh, absolutely. I'd |
| 24 | be happy to share that. |
| 25 | MS. KEYSER: Okay. That would |

1 be great. Thank you. 2 MS. CECIL: And I'm happy to 3 share the Powerpoint presentation that was presented. 4 So, yes, absolutely, we're happy to share that 5 information. MS. KEYSER: That would be 6 7 You can send it to Teresa. Thank you. great. 8 MS. CECIL: What I'll do is 9 we'll send it out to the TAC members. And, then, if anybody else would like to have it, just reach out to 10 11 Sharley and we'll get that to you. 12 MS. KEYSER: Thank you. 13 MR. CAUDILL: Let me ask you. 14 Would it be possible to go one step further and do a 15 summation of the main points out of that meeting? 16 MS. CECIL: Yes, we can do that. MR. CAUDILL: That would be 17 18 great for me. 19 MS. AGAN: Veronica, this is 20 Did you say when the next workgroup session 21 is going to be or did I not hear that correctly? MS. CECIL: I'm hoping to 22 23 finalize that date today. Like I said, I had to 24 reach out to a couple of individuals directly that

didn't indicate the day that almost everybody else

25

1 was available. So, once I get all that confirmation 2 back, I hope to get that out today. 3 MS. AGAN: Okay, but you haven't 4 chosen a date yet. 5 MS. CECIL: No. I think we're looking at May 17th. 6 7 MR. CAUDILL: Any other 8 questions on that for Ms. Cecil? 9 As part of the last meeting, we also talked about some reports that were being done 10 11 and you had identified there were two reports being 12 worked on that there had been a back-and-forth report 13 as to what had been paid, what wraps had been paid so that a reconciliation could occur more realtime and a 14 15 separate report that the providers could utilize as 16 part of their reconciliation. 17 Has there been any progress in 18 those areas? 19 MS. CECIL: They're not 20 finalized yet but I think we're pretty close, 21 definitely on the one to be utilized by the Managed 22 Care Organizations. 23 And, again, the purpose of that 24 is for them to be more proactive in reviewing claims

they've paid and there's no wrap that's been

25

| 1 | generated so that they can go back and review those |
|----|--|
| 2 | and work with providers in case it's a problem from |
| 3 | that side. |
| 4 | MR. CAUDILL: So, it won't |
| 5 | aggravate you if we put that on the agenda for the |
| 6 | next meeting for a status on that? |
| 7 | MS. CECIL: Oh, no. I'm happy |
| 8 | to do that. |
| 9 | MR. CAUDILL: Okay. You and I |
| 10 | have corresponded a little bit during this interim |
| 11 | about a work flow chart. |
| 12 | MS. CECIL: Yes. |
| 13 | MR. CAUDILL: Is that something |
| 14 | that is going to be able to happen? |
| 15 | MS. CECIL: Yes. And I think I |
| 16 | failed to mention one of the key players in this was |
| 17 | Gainwell and they were certainly at the meeting, and |
| 18 | they did take that back and they are working on it. |
| 19 | They said it would take about three weeks. So, we're |
| 20 | right about the time that they might be able to have |
| 21 | that available for us. |
| 22 | MR. CAUDILL: Okay. Great. |
| 23 | Wonderful. Thank you. Any other questions for |
| 24 | Veronica or DMS concerning A? |

MS. AGAN: I'd like to ask

Veronica a question.

So, one of the things that we are currently experiencing is the recent fee schedule adjustments that occurred by one of the MCOs. And when they did their fee schedule adjustments and sent those encounters over, the typical thing happened.

DMS did a complete void of the wrap and recouped all the money and those claims have never gone back through even though it's been months.

So, when you're working on these reports that you're going to send people, we're still sitting here right now with absolutely no direction on current serious problems like that. It holds a lot of money on the table, and the recommendations are do we reach back out to the MCOs or do you go with that?

So, I think that's part of the workgroup agenda and I just want to make sure that we keep that front and center because that's still a very serious problem.

MS. CECIL: Can you send that to me in an email so that I can make sure that it's on our radar?

MS. AGAN: Sure. I can give you (inaudible) numbers, too, if you want them.

1 MS. CECIL: That would be 2 fantastic. 3 MR. CAUDILL: All right. Any 4 other questions or comments? 5 Then, let's move to Item 4B, 6 payments for COVID-19 vaccination administration -7 update from DMS. 8 This surprisingly was a really 9 good conversation we had last time and it took up a 10 lot of pages on the transcript. I know the Department has resolved most of these issues, but 11 12 would someone care to summarize that on behalf of the 13 Department? Veronica, you're nodding. 14 Will 15 that be you? 16 MS. CECIL: I think so. I don't know if Lee Guice has anything to add, but I'm glad 17 that you have this on here because what we wanted to 18 19 double check is to see are providers having any 20 issues with billing that vaccine. 21 The resolution to the back and 22 forth was that we were going to treat the COVID 23 vaccination administration similar to other vaccines. 24 And, so, you would get the administration fee

25

directly.

We did go back and check our system to make sure that it could be billed appropriately fee-for-service side; and as far as we know, I've not heard any issues from that. So, I certainly would like to know if that seems to be going through okay.

MR. CAUDILL: Do any of the providers have any comments or experiences to share with Veronica concerning that?

MS. AGAN: I don't think I can give an update on that today.

MS. CECIL: Well, definitely do reach out fee-for-service or MCO side. This is important to us. We want to make sure. We appreciate what you all are doing to get our population vaccinated. And, so, if there are any challenges to that, please let us know.

MR. CAUDILL: From our standpoint, the solutions that the Cabinet came up with has worked well for us and we're happy with it and not having any problems.

At this point in time, we've given out 11,549 doses since we began and it's working well.

Maybe on subject, maybe off

subject a little bit - perhaps under New Items for Discussion, we'll discuss more of the actual mechanics of how that's going and what trends we're seeing in the COVID distribution. So, I'll wait until that time.

MS. CECIL: I will add that
Secretary Friedlander is very interested in
increasing the population that's vaccinated. And,
so, we have been talking with the MCOs about what
kind of incentives, whether a provider or member
incentive to help push that increase in individuals
who are vaccinated.

So, you may see as we work towards developing that program some more information about that.

MR. CAUDILL: Okay. All right.

Then, that's all under Old Business unless someone
can think of something that should be addressed under
Old Business.

That being said, then, let's go to Item 5 on the agenda which is New Business. The first item is a presentation on the payment methodology for same-day multiple visits.

The Honorable Gene Smallwood, a former Justice and practicing attorney, will present

that. And the reason we're doing that is this has been a subject that has come up in the MAC meeting and other forums and we're trying to legitimize that discussion by providing some actual background upon which it could be based.

So, it will take about ten minutes; and at this time, I will turn this over to Mr. Smallwood to make his presentation.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Good morning.

As Mike said, I'm Gene Smallwood. I'm an attorney
with Steptoe & Johnson out of their Eastern Kentucky
office.

We also have offices in
Lexington and Louisville. Outside of Kentucky, we
have offices in West Virginia, Ohio, Pennsylvania,
Colorado and Texas where we engage in legal work
involving medical clinics, hospitals and long-termcare facilities, among other areas of the law.

I appreciate the opportunity to address the Primary Care Technical Advisory Committee and the others who are participating this morning on this topic.

As Mike said, he asked me to discuss and compare Kentucky's Medicaid payment approach for multiple encounters which occur on the

same day, by the same Medicaid patient but by different medical or behavioral providers.

And let me begin my discussion by setting a context with regard to the discussion.

Nationally, FQHC's and rural health clinics provide medical care to one out of six Medicaid patients.

In Eastern and rural Kentucky, the Medicaid patient load is substantially higher - as much as one out of two encounters are Medicaid patients - due to the elimination of the coal industry in Eastern Kentucky and the effect of the pandemic which has greatly reduced employment in our area.

Under federal law, states are required to establish a per-visit baseline payment rate which is equal to 100% of the FQHC's average costs incurred during base years, which are 1999 through 2000, which are reasonable and related to the cost incurred by the clinic in providing the covered services.

Federal law requires state

Medicaid agencies to pay health care centers a PPS

rate for each face-to-face encounter between the

Medicaid patient and one of the health care clinic's

medical and behavioral providers.

However, CMS currently

authorizes states to limit the number of encounters paid for differing encounters by the same patient and occurring on the same date.

In preparing for this presentation, I have reviewed state regulations and state Medicaid manuals regarding Medicaid payments for encounters which occur on the same date in twenty states, selected at random and including Kentucky, to determine how the other states are handling the federal law mandates and compared them with Kentucky's approach.

For purposes of comparison, I have prepared two charts, one of which demonstrates the limitations upon same-day encounter payments as set out in those regulations or governing manuals, and a second chart to show the specific services authorized for payment----

MR. CAUDILL: Gene, I'm sorry to interrupt. We need the screen-sharing to be activated. Currently it's disabled. We're not able to upload the charts that Gene will be referring to.

 ${\tt MR.}$ SMALLWOOD: There we go.

MR. CAUDILL: I'm sorry.

Please continue.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Thank you, Mike,

because the charts are the important information that I want to pass along and what I have discovered.

The first chart, as you note, deals with the number of encounters paid, and the second chart deals with the types of encounters that are paid.

Let's look at the first chart which concerns a number of paid encounters permitted by the states.

Generally, all of the states I reviewed require the following factors to occur to constitute an encounter eligible for payment.

The first encounter has to be face-to-face. It must be performed by a different medical or behavioral provider, requires a different diagnosis code be used in reporting the claim for payment, and a separate filing or claim be submitted for each encounter on the same date.

All of the states which I reviewed, including Kentucky, pay for a second encounter on the same date if the treatment is for a subsequent injury or illness which caused the patient to return to the clinic after the initial treatment on that same date.

As the chart on the top

demonstrates of the twenty states I reviewed, fifteen

states pay for three or more encounters which occur

on the same day, providing the encounters are for

different services and result from different

diagnosis.

Generally the states pay for one encounter for medical services, one for behavioral services and one for dental services.

Of those fifteen states, three states - Oregon, Washington and Ohio - provide payment for an unlimited number of encounters occurring on the same date. Again, they have to be based on different services provided for different diagnoses.

And that's why I stopped at twenty states because it was apparent that there was a dominant pattern that most states, by in large, pay for up to three encounters occurring on the same date, provided that these encounters are for different services with different diagnoses.

As you will note on the chart, Kentucky stands alone as the only state which limits payments for only one encounter per day, and that is a dramatic difference in what is occurring in other

states.

The effect of Kentucky's approach as compared to the other states' approach, it's apparent. For many of our patients in Eastern and rural Kentucky, and particularly the elderly and those on fixed incomes, the cost required to travel to the medical facility to receive treatment is difficult and expensive.

In the absence of mass transit, it often requires hiring someone to transport the patient to the clinic which in some instances can be a distance of forty-five miles or more from their home.

To minimize this expense, the Medicaid patient will often schedule more than one encounter for different services on the same day at the clinic.

Since Kentucky pays for only one encounter per day, the expenses involved in the second or additional encounters the patient receives on that same day is a cost incurred by the clinic without any opportunity to receive Medicaid payments for those medical or behavioral or dental services which are provided.

In a market where medical

provider costs are already higher than the national average, due to the difficulty in obtaining and retaining qualified medical providers to serve in depressed and rural areas, the cost for these unpaid encounters cuts deeply into the budget of FQHC's or rural health clinics.

Now, let's look at the other chart which demonstrates the particular services that are authorized by the various states for Medicaid payment for multiple encounters.

First off, you'll note that I didn't list any for Kentucky because Kentucky only pays for one encounter regardless of what the nature of the encounter is.

Of the twenty states that I reviewed, fifteen of the states pay, in addition to a medical encounter, for a behavioral encounter and a dental encounter which occur on the same day.

However, a few states, as you will note, will also pay for optometry or ophthalmology services.

Some states like Oregon pay for multiple encounters on the same day but only for specific, enumerated areas of practice set out in the regulations.

Ū

Encounters outside of those areas of medical services which are not identified in the regulations are not paid.

Other states like Washington and Ohio only require that the multiple encounters involve different services with different diagnoses in order to provide payment.

It is important to note that some states include OB/GYN services in their definition of a medical encounter.

Under this restrictive definition, a FQHC or Rural Health Clinic which treats a Medicaid patient for a medical encounter, and, then, on the same day, also treats the patient for an OB/GYN issue, would only receive payment for one encounter.

Other states, however, treat OB/GYN services as a specialty service apart from medical services and authorize payment for that initial encounter.

While limiting payment to no more than three specified and different encounters on the same date is not ideal, it is certainly a vast improvement over Kentucky's restricted approach of only one payment for all encounters occurring on the

same date regardless of the services provided or the diagnoses.

A review and comparison of the other states' approach in paying for multiple encounters on the same date demonstrates that Kentucky is lagging far behind its neighboring and other states in the Medicaid payment approach.

The ramification of Kentucky's restricted approach is that Kentucky's FQHC's and Rural Health Clinics have no state financial incentive to expand their services beyond basic medical care or to expand their physical locations to new or other under-served areas because the funding for these expansions are otherwise diverted to pay the costs incurred in providing the multiple-encounter care on the same date to their patients for which they receive no pay.

This directly and adversely limits the access of Kentucky's residents in Eastern and rural Kentucky in receiving the health care they require and increases their cost to travel and receive that care.

A comparison of how other states approach Medicaid payments for multiple encounters on the same date should cause us in

Kentucky to examine Kentucky's approach and its adverse effect on residents in Eastern and rural Kentucky. It should cause us in Kentucky to revise our payment approach so that it is at least at the level of most other states, and particularly including our neighboring states, so that our residents have access to health care at least at the same level provided in neighboring states.

Revising Kentucky's approach to providing Medicaid payments for up to three encounters on the same date, one for medical services, one for behavioral services, and one for dental services, would increase the opportunity to provide greater access to care for Kentucky's Medicaid patients and improve their level of health, while, at the same time, reducing patient costs to obtain that care.

Are there any questions with regard to the information on these charts and what I' ve talked about this morning?

MR. CAUDILL: And let me be very clear in this. Certainly, it is our policy at MCHC and I'm sure the policy of everyone else, we do our best to see every patient for whatever needs they come in. We refer to ourselves as a one-stop shop

because we're proud of the fact that we work hard to meet these needs.

However, less resources means less services regardless of our attempts, and the converse of that is more resources, the more services that we can do.

So, it's not a matter of what we're doing as much as what are the limitations on being able to do that.

So, this is why I asked Gene to review this and do a presentation so we can have this conversation and what has been alluded to and talked informally about across the state.

So, at this time, are there any questions from anyone concerning Gene's presentation they would like to ask?

MS. KEYSER: Mike, this is
Chris. I've got just a quick question. What would be
the necessary steps for Kentucky Medicaid to consider
a change? Is there some formal adoption that has to
come from CMS for them to do this or is this a
contractual change?

I'm just looking for some more information and maybe somebody from Medicaid can give us an idea as far as what would be a formal way of

having Medicaid consider this.

MS. CECIL: Obviously, there's a budgetary impact to it. And, so, we would have to do that analysis.

My understanding, the last time we looked at this, is that less than half of the states permitted more than one encounter on the same day.

I know that you did good research possibly to the extent possible and came up with twenty, but that means over half of the states still may not permit an encounter, but there is a budgetary impact to that.

I think what we have to really analyze is the point of the rate is to cover costs. It's developed based on cost of services being provided and we have to take that back, and if there's an issue with the rate isn't covering the cost, then, we have to look at that.

MR. SMALLWOOD: If I could address that point as well. I would be glad to look at the other thirty states and report back. I just did not see any evidence that half or more were only paying for one encounter.

I pulled twenty states

randomly, tried to pull the states around Kentucky in particular so you could see what our neighboring states are doing, and it's clear that there is a great preponderance to pay for three encounters or more. And those budgetary issues that our state face are also faced in those other states.

Specifically with regard to the question that was posed, Kentucky's payment approach is set out in our regulations, 907 KAR 1:055. I would think it would require a regulation change and the administrative process would have to be gone through in order to make the change so that Kentucky would be in parity with the states that I have presented in this regard.

MS. CECIL: We would also need CMS authority. So, we would have to file a State Plan Amendment.

MR. CAUDILL: And I think that's what we're looking for is to give a heads up for the Department so that they can have an opportunity to do their own review and verify the information given here.

And it's my understanding that there is talk that something along these lines may be an issue addressed in the next Legislature.

So, these are very early steps in looking at this and a lot of different factors and a lot of different stakeholders have to have the opportunity to look at it and make a reasonable appraisal as to what the effects would be and the desirability of that type of change.

So, this is just a place to start to see how it develops.

MS. CECIL: If the information could be shared with us, especially those charts, that would be helpful.

MR. CAUDILL: Absolutely, we can do that. In very short order, we will get it to you. MS. CECIL: Thank you.

MR. MARTIN: And did you have any research on the methodology of how they reimburse for the three or more encounters?

MR. SMALLWOOD: It is my understanding, and I did not look specifically at that point, but they are paid at the same rate, that each encounter is treated the same, so, it will be the same payment for each encounter.

Now, I will readily admit I did not go into depth with regard to looking at that, but that appeared to be the case from the review of the

statute or the manuals that I looked at.

MR. MARTIN: Thank you.

MR. CAUDILL: So, then, having finished that and there not being any further questions, let's move on to the agenda, then, under 5B, Updates or Announcements from the MCOs.

And to that end, we will follow the same order we did last time. Anthem, is there anyone who would like to report? The last time you had a website redesign that was going to go active as of April 18th and you had a provider coding education series live. Would you like to bring us up to date on what's going on?

MS. SMITH: This is Jennifer with Anthem. So, to follow up on your point, the Medicaid website, the enhancements that are being launched, they are actually expected to be launched now in June. So, next month they should be live. So, just a reminder on that.

I did want to let you guys know that in order for us to communicate more efficiently with providers, we are now sending some bulletins and policy changes, prior authorization updates, educational opportunities to providers via email. So, that is new.

So, in order to receive an email from Anthem, we do ask that you update your email address. We are a provider maintenance (inaudible) and there are additional details around all the information that's going to be expected, that you expected to see in our May, 2021 newsletter that was just launched.

And, then, also, I wanted to let you guys know that Availity is now offering an appointment scheduler for Medicaid. So, this is very new and it's going to be offering many features.

So, providers are going to be able to manage appointments a lot easier. Members can be notified directly via text or email once the appointment is confirmed. And, then, we can also send appointment reminders. And, again, this information is located on our May, 2021 newsletter.

And, then, the last item that I wanted to make you guys aware of, Anthem has launched a new provider experience model that has already been launched throughout Anthem enterprise wide and it is going to cover all lines of business.

So, the initiatives underway are really designed to really improve and simplify processes that are most impactful to you and

eliminating any administrative burden.

So, we're focusing on more informed and faster service, more education and faster training, providing access to performance data and just better navigation of issue resolution, and that's all I have.

MR. CAUDILL: Okay. Thank you.

Any questions?

 $\mbox{MS. KEYSER: Yes. This is} \label{eq:ms. KEYSER: Yes. This is} % \begin{subarray}{ll} \begin{subarray}{ll}$

can you go a little bit more into detail? I was a little confused about setting up appointments on Availity for patients, one, the necessity of doing this when providers have their own appointment systems in their EMR and they're able to send text reminders and email reminders to patients about appointments. You kind of lost me on the functionality and the why of that.

MS. SMITH: Again, if you have your own system set up, you can still use that. This is just an additional feature that we have launched within the Availity portal.

So, if you don't have those options currently available or if you're having issues with it, you can utilize this feature through

Anthem. You don't have to but it is something that I just wanted to let you know that you have available to you.

So, it's probably similar to what many providers are using now but it's just another option that's available.

MR. CAUDILL: Thank you for that presentation. We'll go to WellCare, and the last time they were talking about their National Imaging Association agreement to take over the radiology benefit management. How is that going for you?

MS. KEYSER: Okay. Thank you.

MR. AKERS: First of all, Mike, this is John Akers from WellCare. So, we did transition some of our imaging services over to NIA and we have been working through a few initial issues and working those out. And if anyone has any particular issues you're having with NIA, please feel free to outreach to me or Tony Peagitini or your local PR rep.

Regarding announcements, as we did last year, because of the public health emergency, our annual provider summits are going to be virtual again this year, and the first one coming up on May $14^{\rm th}$.

> 7 8

> > 9

6

10 11

12 13

14

15 16

17

18

19

20

21 22

23

24

25

So, on May 14^{th} , from 12 to 1:30 - that's next Friday - we will have our virtual provider summit. And, hopefully, after the public health emergency is over, we'll be able to move those back to having those in person. If you need the calendar invite, you can reach out to me if you want to or your local PR rep and they can share that calendar invite with you.

MR. CAUDILL: All right. Thank you, Johnie. Any questions for Johnie?

All right. Let's go to Aetna, and the last time, they were talking about their Supporting Kentucky Youth or SKY Program.

MS. ROSE: Good afternoon. This is JoAnn Rose. I'm the Network Manager for the PR team here at Aetna Better Health of Kentucky.

And kind of going along the lines with the Supporting Kentucky Youth, we just want to let you guys know that we are offering our virtual office hours. We do this every other Thursday. It's an hour-long session.

Several folks from our PR team are on there. The hour contains information. first part we've been focused on SKY. Moving on to the month of May, there's going to be a billing and

claims component. So, there will be some training topics on there, as well as, again, the PR team will be on there to discuss any issues that may arise.

And also it's open dialogue. So, it allows for partnership and collaboration between the Network Relations' PR team and the provider. So, we hope providers find it's

informative and a great way to really interact.

We have all the events on the Events' page at our website, or if you need that link, you can reach out to your Network Relations Manager which is also on the website.

MR. CAUDILL: Any questions for JoAnn? Thank you, JoAnn.

Now Humana Healthy Horizons, and last time, they reminded us that the timely filing is 365 days as of July 1 of 2020 but also talked about the shift from denials from the Master Provider List to the system more similar with the previous Humana CareSource and warned us that there might be some confusion when we get a report from the clearinghouse because of that.

If someone is on here, would you care to address how that is working out for you and any other items you'd like to state.

MS. DAY: This is Beth Day with Humana Healthy Horizons. So far so good in rejections for the Master Provider List. We are making available to our providers their information that is on the Master Provider List and that is something that you should be receiving quarterly from your representative.

And as far as new updates go, I did want to share with you some value-added services that we've been approved by DMS to provide to our Medicaid membership, and there is a provider guide on our website called Value-Added Services' Provider Guide and that has FAQ's around these. It has visit limits, age limits and claims submission tips.

The additional services that are able to be provided this calendar year for our members are dual services, chiropractic services, acupuncture services and sports physicals.

I know that we did get the approval to do these a little bit late in the year but there is still a better-than-half portion of the year left to be able to provide these additional services to our membership and we're excited to be able to partner with you guys for those kinds of treatments.

1

2

3

4 5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21 22

23

24

25

MR. CAUDILL: Any questions for

Thank you. Beth?

Next is Passport Health Plan by Molina Healthcare, and last time you were talking about your open mic for providers that's been done on a biweekly basis. Is that still continuing and any other issues or matters you'd like to bring up with us today?

MS. FIFE-CARRIER: Thank you.

Yes, those are still going on based on provider type. That way we're not wasting anyone's time and they don't have to listen to other specialties.

Also, we wanted to bring up that this Saturday, we're hosting a free COVID vaccination workstation centrally located in Louisville and there also will be food trucks. We sent that blast out to most of our providers.

We have communicated with all of our providers that we have a clean check disbursement turnaround time that's averaging less than ten days for all clean claims. So, it's something that we're a little proud of.

We have also added a social determinant of health to our members' packets. way, we know who is at higher risk. We're also

asking hospitals that support the (inaudible) admissions to do the same assessment at the time of discharge. That way we're hopeful in working towards getting our beneficiaries to get connected with services within their community to kind of drive down the chances of readmission.

That's all from Passport.

MR. CAUDILL: Okay. Are there any questions, then, for Shelley?

All right. Then, we move on to United Healthcare, and they were discussing having to work through some bugs for their go-live date. Would you like to go ahead and speak to that, whoever the representative might be?

Do we have anyone on here from United Healthcare? Okay.

Then, we'll move back to our agenda which is 5C, Recommendations to the MAC.

So, based upon the presentation that Mr. Smallwood did, let me suggest one for the Board's consideration.

I would suggest the following recommendation. It is this committee's recommendation to the MAC that they request DMS to review their same-day multiple visit payment

methodology and report back to the MAC comparing

Kentucky's methodology of that of surrounding and

other states to determine if Kentucky's approach is

in parity with the majority of other states, and if

not, to suggest an approach for Kentucky to become

more mainstream with the trends across the country in

reimbursement for same-day multiple visit payment

methodology.

Having said that, would any of the committee members like to comment on that or to adopt that in a motion to approve that as a recommendation for the MAC?

MS. AGAN: Mike, this is Yvonne. I would like to move that we make that recommendation to the MAC as you presented.

MR. MARTIN: I'll second it.

MR. CAUDILL: We have a motion made by Yvonne and seconded by Barry. Is there any discussion? There being none, I'll call that for a vote. Those in favor of the recommendation as presented say aye. Those opposed likewise. Motion carried unanimously.

The next item is 5D, confirmation of Chair to attend the MAC meeting which will occur on May $27^{\rm th}$ from 10:00 to 12:30. I do not

have a conflict. I can attend. If somebody would want to attend instead of me, I certainly will yield to that. Otherwise, I will be in attendance. I will be in attendance at that.

New Items for Discussion. We talked earlier just as a followup on the idea of how well the COVID vaccine is going in Kentucky.

I can tell you that what we have given out earlier is dropping off. Just a summary for MCHC, we gave out 1,174 J&J, 10,279 Moderna and 96 Pfizers.

We're seeing the trend now as dropping off from a high of I think over 1,200 in a week and I think last week we did about 400. Whether it's resistance or what, we're finding it harder and harder.

Also with the reducing of the age so that you can do sixteen and above, we've approached school systems and our feedback has been almost no interest in those of age students taking it. In the Letcher County system - there's 1,200 or so students - only four expressed an interest in having it, being polled through the school.

Is that consistent trends with what other people are seeing that is administering

the vaccine?

MR. MARTIN: Yes. Ours is mirroring that as well. I think we've hit a saturation mark.

MS. KEYSER: I think it also is in regard to COVID testing as well. Our COVID testing has really dropped off. Again, it's waning terribly.

In Warren County, I will say that our local regional hospital, The Medical Center, is providing clinics in the school systems. I can't tell you how well they're being received.

I know that, again, it takes parental consent for those to happen. I think for the most part, they're getting it done. Parents are getting it done, particularly with getting ready for the new school system for the fall, that kind of thing; but I think, again, just overall, everybody is tired and it's getting harder to keep the interest going.

A vaccination that requires the second shot, people not coming back in for the second shot, chasing them down, that type of thing, yeah, I mean, I think those are just some of the challenges that are real in communities.

MR. CAUDILL: I think one of the greatest telling things is we had an opportunity to give out fifty shots on one day back in January and it snowed. Forty-nine of those people showed up to take it, and we later found out the fiftieth also came and took it but they took it through other than our lines. They went through another line for the testing and they gave it to them there.

And that was eighty and above at that time and those are the people that do not come out in bad weather. I think that demonstrates just how important it was. Now just scheduling people to come in on these bright sunny days, we'll have 40% no-shows.

It's just the change in the attitude of people. Those people who want it, believe in it seems to have acquired it at one place or the other. And the people now are resistant or, while not being resistant, they're just laissez faire about it, just not really as important as it once was.

MS. KEYSER: I'm happy to say that at least in Warren County and this area, we have plenty of providers being able to give the vaccine, particularly through pharmacies. The expansion into

pharmacies really opened up a lot of doors.

And, again, in our area, we have a vaccine clinic that's out at our mall in the old Sears building and it's Thursday, Friday and Saturday. I think you can walk in on any of those days and you can get in line and get a shot.

And, so, I think the big part is how do you keep the momentum going because they've made it pretty easy for anybody to just walk in.

It wasn't like in the beginning where you had an appointment months out or weeks out. Availability is readily there.

So, I think those are, again, just challenges to what healthcare providers are doing.

MR. CAUDILL: So, from the Department, hearing this, is this consistent with the feedback that you're getting across the state? And is the Department having any planning sessions to try to motivate people, either change their mind from the resistance crowd or to encourage those that are not really that much into it? What's going on with the Department in this regard?

MS. CECIL: Absolutely we are concerned and that's why we've been in conversations

with the Managed Care Organizations to offer some incentives and to increase outreach.

And I do believe the State has tried to communicate a little better about - well, better may not be the right word - but differently about the importance of the vaccine to try to get over this hesitancy hurdle.

So, there's been increased outreach. I think the difficulty is - Ms. Keyser, you mentioned this - is that the people that were getting tested are the people who really came up first to get vaccinated because they're the most concerned, and I think that's why we're seeing now an enormous decrease in the testing for it.

But, yes, I think we're very concerned, very concentrated on it and have been trying to look at ways to encourage folks to get that vaccine.

I do appreciate the innovation or I guess thinking outside the box of providers, going and doing it at churches. I know here in Frankfort, the local Health Department is going to like four or five churches and having events at those churches to try to get at least the membership from those churches to come and get vaccinated.

So, those are what we're going to have to do now that we've got the individuals who were most concerned and most interested in getting that vaccination is how do we make that available in the community, in the neighborhood and that's what we're working on.

MR. CAUDILL: I wonder if there could be some advertisement aimed at motivating people. I don't know, maybe if some of our recognized sports figures or personalities would do the fifteen-second for it to be put on television and radio - I had mine and it's important that you have yours - if that might help in some ways; but, obviously, at this point, we're digging them out.

We have some mobile vans, and at this point, if two people stop for a conversation, we'll try to show up and offer it to them and we've gone to country stores and employers, jails, centers of government, churches and, still, you're getting the resistance.

We tried to schedule with a large church and there was not enough people even interested in it. Out of several hundred members, there was only like three or four people that were interested in getting it. So, we made arrangements

for them but it was not feasible to go ahead and try to just drive over there for them but we did get them their shots.

MS. CECIL: And I do know what has happened over the past couple of weeks, there was an event in the west end of Louisville. They were able to identify phone numbers and do a call out to people and reach out to help people schedule that vaccination and to encourage them to attend the community event.

And, so, those are the things that we're working on. Information is always the challenge on the front end trying to identify or get contact information for people and reach out to them.

And, then, on the back end, it's, again, trying to incentivize members or providers. With the members on the back end, it is giving them an incentive for having completed the vaccination and how do you verify that. There is a vaccine card, but we're trying to figure out what's the best way to verify that information.

So, we're trying to work through all of those and be as creative as possible and trying to overcome what we're seeing as the dropoff.

_

MS. AGAN: (Inaudible).

MS. CECIL: Absolutely. As you mentioned, I think they have identified figures that are role models, both I think well-named and those that represent the population, especially from a diversity standpoint.

And, so, there's a lot of that going on in phases but what we have to figure out is how do we get that out into, again, the community or on TV so that we're reaching people where they are and how they access that information.

I think our greatest push will come from including community leaders and faith leaders and our advocates, our advocacy organizations in trying to make it not so scary and try to encourage that vaccination to happen.

MR. CAUDILL: Good discussion.

Is there anyone else who would like to comment?

MR. MARTIN: I think we're to a point where it's going to have to be financially driven, some kind of competition to get vaccinated or the Governor's Office start saying that counties that have a low positivity rate can start opening up.

There has to be some kind of financial incentive, and I think the latter would be

the way to do it is look at counties and say if you
have an "x" positivity rate, then, your restaurants
can open up, you can start having meetings, open
meetings. I think doing a pilot of like ten
counties, I think that would be a good trial-anderror method.

MS. CECIL: We appreciate that suggestion.

MR. CAUDILL: To continue the discussion, then, a little bit further. It looks like we can give the vaccines down to sixteen-year-olds and it looks like that's going to go on down to twelve-year-olds.

With that group, the common denominator is they all go to school. I know in the past, there's been some often-ignored regulations. They had to have certain vaccines before they could start school each year.

Is the Department looking at that possibility of maybe some regulations that would require students to get it unless they fall under one of the usual exceptions?

MS. CECIL: Well, the Department for Medicaid Services doesn't have that authority.

That's a Department for Education or the Governor, I

think, but, again, I think that's a suggestion that's worth exploring.

MR. CAUDILL: Kids, right now we're going through the prom and we've shown a little bit of an uptick that we're tracing back to kids going to the prom and spreading it that way.

Okay. If there's no further discussion, are there any other new items that would like to be addressed?

MS. CECIL: Mr. Caudill, if you don't mind, I would like to give an update on the Managed Care Organization Pharmacy Benefit Manager implementation.

Just to let you all know, we're moving towards July $1^{\rm st}$. We shared a letter last month with I think the MAC and all the TACs about the implementation and some webinars that are going on right now.

I'm happy to re-send that, reshare that, kind of put it on top of everybody's email. The next webinar is May 14th from 4:00 to 5:00 and it's for all providers, not just pharmacy, and, so, prescribers accessing that.

There's another one on June $$15^{\rm th}$$ from 1:00 to 2:00 and, again, I'm happy to send

that back around.

I'm cautiously optimistic that things are going well. What we're really focused on right now is - of course, we already have the single PDL. So, that transition is pretty easy to the new PBM.

What we're looking at is non-PDL items and over-the-counter items and making sure because the MCOs had different policies around that. So, the Department is looking at that and making sure that there is consistency. So, we're reviewing those right now.

And we are working on a prescriber letter that will go out hopefully before June 1st to the providers. So, I just wanted to put that on your all's radar and let you all know that that's going on.

It's the first in the country to have this kind of model. So, it is very different and that means that some of the decisions we're making had to be thought about. And it's a little different because any Medicaid-enrolled pharmacy becomes the network.

So, in the past, I know MCOs might have had different networks, especially around

1 mail order or specialty. The way that we're doing 2 it, it is the fee-for-service network which is any Medicaid-enrolled pharmacy provider. 3 4 So, that's going to be very 5 different, but what we hope for some administrative 6 simplification is that we'll now have just the one 7 PBM that you'll have to deal with and we think that's 8 going to be better for providers. 9 MR. CAUDILL: Thank you for bringing that to our attention. It would be good if 10 11 you don't mind re-sending those things. 12 questions or comments for Veronica? 13 MS. AGAN: Thank you for sharing 14 that. 15 MR. CAUDILL: Chris, did you 16 have something? 17 MS. KEYSER: No. I was just 18 going to say I appreciate that. I think overall 19 that's a worthwhile change that providers are excited 20 about. 21 MR. CAUDILL: Okay. Are there 22 any other items for discussion that would like to be 23 brought up by anyone? 24 The next meeting for the PCTAC

will be July 1st of this year, of course, from 10:00

25

| 1 | to 12:30. |
|----|---|
| 2 | MS. KEYSER: Mike, this is |
| 3 | Chris. I'm just letting you know I will not be able |
| 4 | to attend that meeting. |
| 5 | MR. CAUDILL: Okay. Chris |
| 6 | cannot attend. Thank you, Chris. |
| 7 | There not being any other |
| 8 | items, Item 6, then, is Adjournment. Would anyone |
| 9 | like to make that motion? |
| 10 | MS. AGAN: I make that motion. |
| 11 | MR. MARTIN: I'll second it. |
| 12 | MR. CAUDILL: Motion made by |
| 13 | Yvonne, seconded by Barry. All those in favor say |
| 14 | aye. Have a wonderful day, everybody. |
| 15 | MEETING ADJOURNED |
| 16 | |
| 17 | |
| 18 | |
| 19 | |
| 20 | |
| 21 | |
| 22 | |
| 23 | |
| 24 | |
| 25 | |